

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXI. No. 23.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1812.

[Price 1s.]

"One of the greatest privileges enjoyed in this country, is the freedom of expressing our opinions on all subjects; but, if such horrid acts are to be perpetrated, this country can be considered as little better than those where despotism prevails. Whatever differences of opinion may exist on any one subject, every man has a right to entertain his own opinions, to express what he feels, and to act accordingly."—Mr. PONSONBY's Speech in the House of Commons, 13th May, 1812.

705] ————— [706

TO THE PRINCE REGENT,

ON THE CASE OF MR. BELLINGHAM,

And on certain circumstances connected with, and growing out of, the act for which he has recently suffered death.

LETTER II.

Sir,

I now proceed to address your Royal Highness upon the subject of the grants of money, that have been made to the family of your late Minister, Mr. Perceval, and which do appear to me not to have been merited. The sum altogether is enormous. The pension to the widow and the eldest son, if calculated at the usual rate of life, together with the fifty thousand pounds down, cannot be reckoned at less than *Eighty Thousand Pounds*; and this is granted out of the taxes raised upon the people at a time when distress is felt from one end of the kingdom to the other; at a time when hunger is driving thousands upon thousands of Englishmen to brave all the dangers of our terrible penal code.

These grants cannot be grounded upon any merits of the parties to whom they are made. Of these parties the public know nothing at all. They consist of a widow and her twelve children, and, doubtless, they are an afflicted widow and children. But, Sir, the circumstances of widowhood, and of numerous family, and of deep affliction, are no grounds, and do not all together form any ground for a claim upon the public purse. If they did, how many thousands would be in affluence, who are now in the poor-house! The claim, therefore, to these grants must rest upon the merits of the husband and father deceased, on which merits I now proceed to offer most respectfully to your Royal Highness such remarks as appear to me to be called for by the circumstances of the case.

The grounds upon which the grants

ought to rest, are these: that the deceased had rendered certain services to the country; that he was still in the course of rendering those services; and that, so being occupied, he lost his life. It would, therefore, fairly come before the public to inquire, whether he really did his duty towards Mr. Bellingham; for, in order to secure the widow of an officer a pension, he must not only lose his life on service, but he must lose it for the *public good*. If he lose his life in a duel, his widow will have no pension; and Mrs. Perceval and her children are to have pensions and allowances equal to those of about two hundred officers' widows and families. The merits of Mr. Bellingham's case, therefore, should have been fully investigated, it appears to me, before a single farthing should have been granted to the family of the man whom he had killed; and, if it had appeared, that Mr. Perceval had not paid due attention to the claim of Mr. Bellingham; if it had appeared, that the former had, by his arrogance, or by any other sort of misconduct, produced the fatal catastrophe, in that case he ought not to have been regarded as having lost his *life in the service of the country*, and his family would have stood simply as claimants on the score of the *public services* of its deceased head.

What, then, I would ask, have been the *services* of Mr. Perceval? This, Sir, is a question which has been put ten million times since the day when the grant of money was moved for. What, say the people, has he done for us? In what has he bettered our situation? Or, rather, in what respect has he not made it worse than it was before he became minister? He has added to the taxes raised in Great Britain only, 14,000,000 a year: at the same time that he has added nearly 150,000,000 to the national debt; and thus has he, during the five years that he has been minister, expended (*beyond* the revenue in existence before) about 200 millions of pounds, the

effects of which have been felt by every family in the country, those only excepted who live, in part or in whole, upon the taxes. And what, say the people, has he done for our country with all these mighty means? He has, to be sure, sent an expedition to Walcheren; he has, to be sure, been engaged in the deliverance of Europe in Sicily and in Spain and in Portugal; but, has he delivered any part of Europe? Has he produced any impression upon the enemy? Is not the case of Europe far more desperate than it was when he became minister; that is to say, if the predominance of Napoleon renders it desperate? At home what has he done! But, this question has already been answered by the voice of the people of Nottingham, Leicester, Sheffield, Wakefield, Chester, Birmingham, Carlisle, &c. &c., when they received the news of his death. He has, to be sure, strengthened us with *Foreign Troops* and with *Barracks*; and, if he had not come to an untimely end, he would have added to the last, and, probably, to the first also.

The people of England are apt to forget; but, they have not yet forgotten, his *public services*, which were of too remarkable a nature to be easily obliterated from their minds. They recollect his conduct relative to the inquiry into the transactions of the Duke of York and Mrs. Clarke; they recollect his *trap* to catch offenders in the act of selling places under government; they recollect him when accused by Mr. Madocks relative to the seat of Quintin Dick; they recollect these things and a great many more, and it will require something a little more potent than speeches and paragraphs to rub them out of their recollection. During his administration the jails have been filled with persons prosecuted, by the government, for libel. For the last hundred years England has not seen any thing like this until he became minister.

Much has been said of the *gentleness* and *humanity* of his nature. In what this was discovered, except in his deportment towards his own family (and tigers are gentle to their young ones), I am at a loss to imagine. As far as the public know any thing of him, the contrary appears to have been the truth. He began his career at the bar as a holder of briefs in *state prosecutions* in the counties where he went on the circuit; and, I believe, he made his beginning in the prosecution of Mr. PHILLIPS (now Sir Richard) at Leicester, for selling *Paine's Rights of Man*, upon which occa-

sion he made a most virulent and venomous attack upon the party prosecuted. This was his out-set in politics as well as in law; and his progress certainly did not disgrace the beginning.

There are, however, two recent instances, in which the disposition of the man was made fully appear. I allude to the case of MR. BEAUMONT, who was imprisoned in Newgate for a libel; and to the case of ADAMS, the man who suffered so much torture in Devonshire in order to get out of the army. MR. BEAUMONT was prosecuted by Gibbs for publishing a *libel on the king*. The substance of the publication was, that there was a secret influence behind the throne greater than the throne itself. This had been said and sung many times before; but, be that as it may, the man was prosecuted, found guilty, and sentenced to be imprisoned in Newgate for *two years*, and, at the expiration of the time, to pay a *fine*. Beaumont was a poor man, and, of course, his family were reduced to the greatest misery. When his time expired, he had not the means to pay the fine. He petitioned your Royal Highness to have it remitted. He was referred, as is usual, he was told, in such cases, to the *Treasury*, the fine being a debt to the crown; but, though his two years were expired, and though he had been in jail *some months before he received judgment*, he was suffered still to remain in Newgate for *some months longer*; and, at last, I believe, he went out by virtue of the *insolvent act*.

The other instance of MR. Perceval's *gentle disposition* has been the subject of much animadversion all over the country. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, on the 15th of April last, in a speech relative to flogging soldiers, mentioned the sufferings of PHINEAS ADAMS, at Taunton, in Devonshire, who had undergone the most horrible torture, in order to get out of the army and out of the reach of the lash. Sir Francis stated, that Adams, amongst other tortures, had endured that of pins thrusted up under his nails; that he had been *scalped*, and had his skull scraped, that he endured all these tortures in order to get his discharge; that his resolution seemed more than mortal, and, that only at the moment when the instrument reached the bone of his skull could he be made to utter a single groan. This, Sir, was a recital not much calculated, one would suppose, to excite ridicule in a speaker or laughter in an audience; but, it stands reported in the newspapers, that MR. Perceval made a jest of

the " or uttered the rep Perceva " laugh part of thus : " cumu " upon " able " select " autho " gave " inform " insens " so mu " taken " Baron " part, " so cre " alto " publi " of fab " endur " could " he w " scrap " [a LA " well a " being " but o " the n " and n " Perce " heard your Mi Alas ! h long dur papers, Mr. Per expiring the " O the same ridicule On th as well became to Sir F at least, have at through sage, as thus : " ed the " thrust " news- " this ad " way o " shamin " that h

the “*oh!*” that, as Sir Francis said, was uttered by Adams at the *scalping*. And, the report further says, that when Mr. Perceval uttered the “*oh,*” there was “*a laugh in the Honourable House.*” The part of the report here alluded to stands thus: “Would the production of the document required throw the faintest light upon any of the cases which the Honourable Baronet (Sir Francis Burdett) had selected from the news-papers; to which authority, however, he declared that he gave little credit? Would it afford any information upon the instance of singular insensibility which he had adduced with so much ostentation, and which (though taken from a news-paper) the Honourable Baronet implicitly believed? For his part, he (Mr. Perceval) was not quite so credulous, for *he discredited the story altogether.* The statement that was published bore upon the face of it marks of fabrication: it was said that the man endured the most exquisite tortures that could be invented, unmoved, until at last he was trepanned, and the brain being scraped, he simply exclaimed “*Oh!*” [a LAUGH.] This might be true, as well as the addition to it—that the man being discharged, instantly recovered; but on hearing that a press-gang was in the neighbourhood, made his escape, and never was heard of afterwards. Mr. Perceval thought that he never had been heard of before [a laugh.] How merry your Minister was, Sir, upon this subject! Alas! his mirth was not destined to be of long duration! When I read, in the newspapers, the plaintive “*Oh,*” uttered by Mr. Perceval at the moment when he was expiring, I could not help calling to mind the “*Oh,*” uttered by him, upon nearly the same spot, only a few days before, in ridicule of Phineas Adams.

On this occasion, however, the veracity as well as the humanity of Mr. Perceval became in question. He stated, in answer to Sir Francis Burdett, certain facts. ‘Or, at least, he made some assertions, which have attracted a good deal of attention throughout the country. The whole passage, as published in the Courier, stands thus: “The Hon. Baronet had mentioned the case of a militiaman who had pins thrust under his nails: but the same news-paper statement which contained this account, added, that it was, not by way of punishment, but because he had shamed dead to avoid punishment—that he had lain in this state of insensi-

bility for days together, and had been even scalped to see whether his senses could be restored. The close of all was, that he afterwards got up and ran away, and had never been more heard of since. This story, which was said to have happened at Taunton, had afterwards been inquired into, and was found to have no foundation in fact. Now it was rather singular that the Honourable Baronet, who was in the habit of professing very little respect for news-paper authority, should have taken it from a news-paper, and gravely brought it forward as a fact, and a proof of the system of torture practised in the army. [Hear! hear!] It would have been easy to obtain information on this point, but this might not have suited the Hon. Baronet’s object. The story had falsehood on the very face of it; and those whose business it was to inquire, had found it so.” Now, Sir, since this speech was made, an account of the whole matter has been published at Taunton (in a paper called the TAUNTON COURIER) under the signature of one of the surgeons, who attended poor Adams, and who raised the scalp upon his head. This account agrees perfectly with that of Sir Francis Burdett. Upon what authority, then, did Mr. Perceval assert, that the whole story was a falsehood? Upon what authority did he assert, that those whose business it was to inquire into the matter, had found the whole story to be a falsehood? Upon what grounds did he make these assertions? He not only made these assertions; but he broadly insinuated, that it had not suited Sir Francis to inquire into the facts; or, in other words, that he had dwelt upon what he had reason to believe was false; because, said he, “it would have been easy to obtain information on the point.” It appears to me quite impossible to justify, or to palliate, this conduct of Mr. Perceval. He not only asserted what he must have known to be false, but he accused his adversary of *intentional falsehood*. This is one way of answering a statement, to be sure; but, it is a way which can excite in no good man any regret for its being put a stop to.

With me, it requires nothing more than these instances to mark and fix the character of the man. When, therefore, I hear members of parliament talking of the excellence of the disposition of Mr. Perceval, I cannot help wishing, that they would give us some instances of it. They may, however; rest satisfied, that the people see his

character in its true light; and that those at Nottingham (whom I, for my part, shall always hold in particular respect) have, upon this occasion, spoken the voice of all England.

It has been alleged, Sir, that Mr. Perceval's family ought to be provided for, *because he was killed for having expressed his opinion and acted upon that expression.* This was the argument of Mr. PONSONBY, who, after the words which I have taken for my motto, added, "If any man suffer "for a *conscientious discharge of his duty,* "there is not a man in England who is not "bound to assert the principle, that he is "entitled to be protected, and that the "House is bound, as far as the nature of "the case will admit of, to remunerate his "family for the loss they may have sus- "tained." According to this doctrine (taking in that of my motto which goes immediately before this passage), why should not the family of Mr. Gilbert Wakefield come to the House for compensation? For, there is, I believe, in the mind of no man, a doubt, that Mr. Wakefield lost his liberty, and, finally, his life, in the *conscientious discharge of what he deemed his duty.* I speak not here of those, who, under Perceval's own administration, have been imprisoned and ruined in health and estate for having done what Mr. Ponsonby says every man has a right to do, namely, *express their opinion:* I speak not here of those; nor need I; for there are quite enough who have suffered before that, since the commencement of the war against the Republicans of France; and I see no reason why they, if alive, or their families, should not receive remuneration. Some of them have, indeed, survived; and none of them have been actually killed at once. But, they have all suffered worse than death; and what has been infinitely worse for the country; because their punishment has been such as to excite less attention than more sanguinary punishments would have excited.

In speaking of the provision for Mr. Perceval's family, it has been represented as being due to them *in lieu of what he would have gained at the bar.* This is a mode of reckoning which has been much in practice of late years, since the government has been in the hands of lawyers; but, the impudence of it is, surely, without a parallel. It is perfectly notorious, that, in general, barristers become placemen because they cannot get their bread at the bar. Besides, who forces them to become placemen? Is

it not their own act? Aye, Sir, and the time, which, if spent at their books, would make them *lawyers*, is spent in hunting after employments in the offices of government. And, as to Mr. Perceval himself, it is very well known, that his practice at the bar was very insignificant. Indeed, that he had scarcely any practice at all but what he derived from the government; that, he became Solicitor General in 1800, or thereabouts; and that, previous to that time, the briefs that he held were chiefly such as were put into his hands by the Solicitors of the Treasury, Customs, and Excise. He, as I said before, was first brought out at Leicester, in the prosecution of Mr. Phillips, for selling Paine's Rights of Man; and in this way he was employed by the government till he became Solicitor General. The government has always, I believe, been his chief paymaster; and, dull as the people of England may be thought, Sir, they know that when the government is paymaster, they themselves have to furnish the money. They, therefore, can see no reason whatever for their being now compelled to maintain this man's family; and they will not, I am certain, be well pleased till the burden shall be taken from their shoulders.

Besides, Sir, he *had received* vast sums of money from us. He was, at the early part of his ministry, in the annual receipt of about £6,000 a year; and, since the resignation of the Duke of Portland, in the receipt of about £12,000 a year, besides a house to live in, maintained by the public at great expense. This was not only sufficient, but much more than sufficient. The *smallest sum* he received EXCEEDED THE ANNUAL SALARY OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; and yet the latter is the Chief Magistrate of a people as numerous as the inhabitants of Great Britain, if we except the paupers, the tax-gatherers, the soldiers and the sailors. How much a man like Mr. Perceval would have been able to earn in America I know not; but, I think, it will be allowed, that he did not deserve more than is given to Mr. MADISON, who, while we have been harassed with wars and distresses, has, together with his predecessors, preserved peace and prosperity to the people who have had the good sense to choose him. Yes, Sir, I do think, that the people of England, and that the whole world, will be of opinion, that this barrister was well paid in a sum equal to that of the salary of

the C
States,
genero
nearly
been i
much
dent!
glad to
this.
press t
call m
I still
money
pended
in Eng
receive
much
States,
trate of
chief of
nisters
nance,
receive
SO M
CEIVI
ENGL
ministe
found M
of Fore
Secreta
roe rec
man a
£12,00
for my
cannot
should
function
Your
minded
of this
told, th
a legal
the hol
that pr
unknow
you ma
the cau
expend
that ex
into th
who are
always
and sin
parison
country
conduct
When,
received
of Com

the Chief Magistrate of the American States, which remain *united* in spite of the generous and humane scheme of the *Employers of Captain Henry!* But, it is now nearly four years that Mr. Perceval has been in the receipt of more than *twice* as much as the salary of the American President! And, Sir, I, for one, should be glad to hear what *reason* can be given for this. For the writers of a prostituted press to abuse me, to call me jacobin, to call me incendiary, is no *answer* to me. I still say, that I see no reason why the money of the people should be thus expended. I see no reason why the minister in England, the servant of the King, should receive from the public purse twice as much as the President of the American States, twice as much as the Chief Magistrate of a great and a free nation. The chief officers under the President, the ministers of *Foreign Affairs*, of *War*, of *Finance*, in America, do not, *all put together*, receive from the public A FOURTH PART SO MUCH AS MR. PERCEVAL RECEIVED FROM THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND. Yet, Sir, those American ministers are men of talents. We have found Mr. MONROE, who is now Minister of Foreign Affairs, quite a match for our Secretaries of State. And this Mr. Monroe receives £900 a year, while such a man as Mr. Perceval received about £12,000 a year. Really, Sir, I cannot, for my part, see why this should be; I cannot see why the people of England should be compelled to pay their public functionaries at this enormous rate.

Your Royal Highness need not be reminded of the state in which the finances of this country now are; you need not be told, that the bank notes are become in effect a legal tender; you need not be told that the holders of funded property tremble for that property. These things cannot be unknown to your Royal Highness; but, you may, perhaps, not have reflected upon the *cause*. That cause is, the boundless expenditure of the government; and, of that expenditure, no small part has gone into the pockets of individuals. Those who are interested in supporting this system, always speak of the salaries and pensions and sinecures of each individual in comparison with the whole of the revenue of the country. But this, like all the rest of their conduct, is grounded in a desire to deceive. When, for instance, we speak of the money received by different members of the House of Commons, as stated in the report of

1808, they say, “what is that sum compared to the whole of the revenue?” But, if they were told, that the sum was *equal to the assessed and land taxes of two thirds of Scotland*; and that if the members of the House of Commons would not put any of the public money in their pockets, (two thirds) Scotland might go free from assessed and land taxes; if they were told this, they would, impudent as they are, be at a loss for a reply. If they are told, that the sinecure places of LORD ARDEN (the brother of Mr. Perceval) amount in gross (agreeably to the account laid before parliament) to upwards of £38,000 a year, they answer, “what is ‘the sum of £38,000 a year to the great ‘revenue of England?’” But, if they were told, that £38,000 is equal to the *land and assessed taxes of about SIXTY PARISHES*; if they were told this, they would not know very well what to say. The expenditure of a nation, as well as of a single family, is made up of numerous individual items, and if each of these be disregarded because it is small compared with the whole of the expenditure, it is manifest that ruin must ensue. The whole of our present embarrassments, as well as all the dangers which hang over us, do, in my opinion, arise from bestowing unnecessarily the public money upon individuals. This opinion is not stated at hazard; it is grounded upon minute examination; and, I think myself capable of *proving* it to the perfect satisfaction of your Royal Highness, though the present is not the fit occasion for so doing. But, Sir, proved it will and must be: men; parties; factions; may say what they please. Falsehoods may be encouraged and Truth may be punished; but EVENTS, of which we have already seen some that were not generally expected; EVENTS will call forth the proof, will discover the cause, and will point out the remedy.

In returning to Mr. Perceval, we must not forget what he had secured to him in *reversion*; for, that was so much *gain* as far, at least, as his *wishes* could go. He had the grant in reversion of his brother's enormous sinecures; that is to say, £38,000 a year, exclusive of what is said to arise from interest of public money in his hands. Taking it, however, at £38,000 a year, this was the revenue, the reversion of which was granted to Mr. Perceval for his life. And, is such a reversion to be regarded as nothing? It would, I dare say, have sold for £100,000; and, if the heir did not sell it, the reason was, that he pre-

fferred keeping it. It was *worth* so much; and, if he did not live to possess the revenue of it, the fault was not with those who granted it. And, it is always to be borne in mind, that this grant was made many years ago. Indeed the grant was made in the year 1764, that is to say, 48 years ago. When the *reversion* to Mr. Perceval was granted I do not find stated in any account to which I have had access; but, I find it stated, that the grant of the sinecures was made 48 years ago. The gross receipt of Lord Arden, exclusive of interest of public money in his hands, was, in 1808, upwards of 38 thousand pounds. The exact sum was £38,566; and, as there is no reason to suppose, that the sum has been much less, during the wars against France, it follows, that the whole of the money received for these sinecures, since 1793 only (allowing *nothing* for the time of peace) would be £794,188. And, if the compound interest be taken into the account, the sum will be considerably above *a million of pounds sterling*. This is for only *twenty years past*; only 20 years out of the 48 years; and, there must, during the American war, have been some rich harvests for these same sinecure offices. And yet, Sir, we are told, under the form of a report of a speech in the House of Commons, that this Lord Arden, in weeping over the body of Mr. Perceval, exclaimed, "*what will become of his twelve children!*" But, this is too curious a matter not to be more particularly noticed. The speech, to which I allude, is attributed to a Mr. LUSHINGTON, who, in support of the parliamentary grant, is reported to have spoken thus:—"I will mention a circumstance deeply calculated to impress the feelings of the House. I saw Lord Arden, the brother of Mr. Perceval, overwhelmed with grief, and his hand placed upon his body, near the part where the fatal wound was inflicted: 'My brother!' he exclaimed, 'you are gone! you are gone to Heaven! but your children—.' His children, replied an Honourable Member standing by, 'are his country's!'—I hope this declaration will be verified, and that the liberality of Parliament will protect them in a manner adequate to the occasion."—One would imagine, Sir, that Lord Arden need not have been so very unhappy about the means of support for the children, even if they had been *twelve hundred* in number in place of *twelve*. How readily, however, the "*Honourable member*" found out a source of comfort for his Lordship! How

ready he was to throw the children upon the country; upon that people, whom their father and uncle had so largely contributed to burden! Is it wonderful, Sir, that the people, when they hear these things, are out of humour? Is it wonderful that they discover their discontents? To be sure, there was no law to compel Lord Arden to support his brother's children; and, if his name had been left unmentioned, he might have passed unnoticed; but, when his lamentations for the children are pushed forward in support of a grant out of the public money, that public have a right to inquire into the extent of the means which he himself derives from their purse.

Much has been said, Sir, respecting the *private virtues* of your late minister, and, indeed, they appear to have been brought forward in a very prominent way in support of the grant that has been made out of the public money. It has been urged, that being so good a *husband* and *father*, his loss to his family is the greater, and, therefore, the greater ought to be the *remuneration*; and, upon this curious logic is built a part, at least, of the claim. But, Sir, what benefit did the public derive from the private virtues of Mr. Perceval? Supposing him to have been a kind husband and a tender father; and, it is mere *supposition*, for we have no *proof* of the fact. If the real truth were known, he would, perhaps, be found not to have led the life of a turtle dove any more than his neighbours. But, if we admit the fact, to which I have no objection; if we admit him to have lived very happily in his family, the merit was Mrs. Perceval's, and not his; and though he might owe her great gratitude, it does not follow that the people of England are to pay her money for having made him happy. The *person* of Mr. Perceval (for they will force us to go into his family affairs) was such as fairly to entitle Mrs. Perceval to something beyond the usual standard in the way of complaisance on his part. There is far less merit in the attentions of such a man; and, therefore, if he found happiness at home, it only proves the amiable disposition and the good sense of his wife.

But, Sir, his conduct towards his wife and family has nothing to do with his public conduct. To admit that it has, would be to lay all public principle prostrate at the feet of hypocrisy. It is a great advantage to a man to live happily in his family; it is a great misfortune when he does not; but, between man and wife who is to be

judge? umpire a man both fortunate. depend and inde dom ha betwee matter virtue said in who is fied, where husband longs. of foll ther, as a m wife an unnatu or eve when brute by liv differe differe gard i of his pose, that a curity public fond a the n bowel heart- justly conju

The ter, I made Ther none speak He w so fa nence used. But, desty writt and supp as o tio or, whic

judge? Of their disputes who is to be the umpire? All that one can say, is, that, if a man live happily with his wife, they are both fortunate; if not, they are both unfortunate. Their happiness, or unhappiness, depends upon so many and such peculiar and inexplicable circumstances, that it seldom happens that a third party can judge between them; but, as far as relates to the matter of "*constancy*," of which, as a virtue of Mr. Perceval, so much has been said in the news-papers, there is no man, who is not equal to *Old Hypocrisy Personified*, who will pretend to deny, that, wherever that virtue is found to exist in a husband, *to the wife solely* the merit belongs. At any rate, it must be the height of folly, or of hypocrisy, or of both together, to pretend, that a man is the better as a minister because he is constant to his wife and fond of his children. Who is so unnatural as not to be fond of his children, or even of his wife's children, especially when brought up under his roof? The brute creation become fond of each other by living together, though brought from different parts of the world, and though of different kinds; and, are we, then, to regard it as a merit in a man that he is fond of his own children? Nor are we to suppose, that a fondness for wife and children, that a tenderness towards them, is any security at all for a tenderness towards *the public*. The vulture is as constant and as fond as the dove; and the former, even at the moment when he is tearing out the bowels of the chicken, and, in spite of the heart-piercing screams of the mother, is bearing off his prey to his own nest, may justly boast of being actuated by feelings of conjugal and paternal fondness.

Thus, in whatever light I view the matter, I can find no grounds for the grant made to the family of your late minister. There is, however, one character, in which none of his eulogists have thought proper to speak of him; namely, that of AUTHOR. He was the author of a book, and a book so famous as to be called, by way of eminence, THE BOOK, an appellation, thus used, heretofore confined to the Bible. But, such appears to have been his modesty, in this character, that, after having written his book, caused it to be printed, and to be stitched up ready for sale, he suppressed it with as much care and anxiety as other authors discover in the promulgation and circulation of theirs. This Book, or, rather, *The Book*, with the merits of which your Royal Highness is supposed to

be extremely well acquainted, has been kept from the public, in this country (though part of it has been printed and published in Germany); but, it will not always be so kept. When the Book shall be published, and not till then, the people of England will be fully acquainted with the character of its author; and, indeed, the history of the Book will bring to light the true character of many others as well as he. But, in the meanwhile, it must be confessed, that even the known part of his conduct in this affair does not place him in a very enviable point of view; and, I cannot help thinking, that, while it remained unexplained, no monument should have been voted to his memory, lest the publication of The Book should render it a monument of national folly.

In conclusion, though it is starting a new subject, I cannot refrain from calling to the mind of your Royal Highness the advice I took the liberty to offer you in the winter of 1811, upon the subject of *choosing a ministry*. I then advised you to appeal to *the people*; to strengthen yourself by an association with them, the natural allies of a constitutional King of England. If your Royal Highness had so done, you would not have experienced what you have experienced during the last three weeks. If there had wanted any thing to convince you of the absolute necessity of a reform in the Commons' House of parliament, it must, I think, now be no longer wanting. The House, the very same members, who have, through all its measures, supported the ministry of Mr. Perceval, have now called upon you to *change that ministry*; and, for what? Because Mr. Perceval is dead? Surely it was easy to find a man to supply his place; and, mark the fact, his incapacity as prime minister had been declared by one of his former colleagues, and by that colleague, too, whom the same House of Commons have now seemed willing to receive as his successor. The fact is, Sir, and it is a fact of great importance, that the House, in calling upon you to change your ministers, do, in fact, call upon you for a *change of measures*; it being notorious, that the Opposition are for measures the opposite, in most respects, of those which have, for a long while past, been pursued. And, what is the reason for their demanding this change of measures? The death of Mr. Perceval? That will hardly be alleged to be the fact. It will hardly be asserted, that *Catholic Emancipation* and a *repeal of the Orders in Council*, which they voted

against before, are become proper measures in consequence of Mr. Perceval's death. His death never can have produced this wonderful effect. No, Sir, the real cause of this change of views in the House is, their alarm at the prospect before them. They apprehend, and justly, that, if there be not a very great change of measures, the most awful calamities are unavoidable. It is not Mr. Perceval's *death* which has created this alarm. If he had died in his bed, or had been shot by a highwayman, your Royal Highness would have heard of no Address for a change of ministry. Sir Vicary Gibbs, or some such person, would have supplied his place, and all would have gone on as usual. But, it was the *time*, the *place*, the *alleged motive*, of killing him; and more, especially the unequivocal applause which the act received from a large portion of the people; it was this, Sir, that excited the alarm, and that produced the Address for a change of men, it being well known, that, in this case, a change of men must produce a change of measures.

But, Sir, this change will, I am afraid, be no more than another palliative. It will not, I fear, include that change, without which all others are useless, a reform in the Commons' House of Parliament. To the want of this reform *every* evil we experience may be traced. There is not one the root of which is not here. That Debt, which now hangs like a millstone about the neck of the country; all the calamities of the war; the war itself, with all the poverty and misery that it has engendered; all, all come from a want of a full and fair representation of the people in that House of Parliament which belongs to them. If we look back for any number of years, within fifty, we shall find, that the situation of the country, let who would be in power, has gradually become worse and worse. It is worse now than it was in January last; and, this being the case, it would be madness to suppose that it will mend, while the same system is pursued. To do any thing effectual, then, we must have a change of the system, which change, as it necessarily embraces a vast diminution in the public expenditure, in peace as well as in war, as necessarily embraces a reform of parliament, without which it is worse than nonsense to talk about œconomy in the management of the national resources. Therefore, if I had had the honour to be of your Royal Highness's cabinet, I should have strenuously advised you to answer the Address of

the Honourable House, by assuring them, that, as they had now, all of a sudden, thought it proper to recommend to you to change those ministers whom they had uniformly supported for so long a time past, even in the imposing of restrictions upon yourself, you wished to resort to the decision of a third party, namely, *the people*; and that, as, from the Address of the House, it appeared that the crisis called for an *administration* upon a *broad basis*, you thought full as likely to be beneficial to take measures for insuring a *parliament* upon a *broad basis*. I should further have advised your Royal Highness to express your hope, that talents like those of Mr. Perceval, used in the way described in Mr. Madocks's motion, would, in future, be rendered useless; and, that, when the new House should be assembled, you entertained not the smallest doubt of perceiving that the people as well as the parliament had become fully sensible of the *benefits of change*.

Such an answer as this would have made the neighbourhood of your palace ring with applause. You might have been wholly regardless of the intrigues of this or of that faction. But, Sir, amongst all the parties, and factions, and cabals, the people see nobody for them. The people look upon all the factions with the same eyes; and, they yet wait for the expression of sentiments by your Royal Highness calculated to inspire them with the hope of seeing better days. Your Royal Highness, must, I think, be convinced, that it is not the intrigue of any party; that it is not an ordinary contest for power, which has now pressed upon you the necessity of a change of ministry; but, that it is the great and imperious circumstances of the country, which, in the minds of the holders, have put the *boroughs themselves* in jeopardy. These holders hope, by the means of a change of ministry, to preserve their power. They know their own interests as well as most people; but, the times are very different from any that they have before seen. They, in getting rid of one danger, are running headlong into another, which they do not perceive, but which is full as certain in its final effects as that which they are so anxious to avoid.

Amongst the many disagreeable circumstances of the times, there is one which must give pleasure to every friend of freedom; and that is, that none of the evils that now exist, or of the greater evils that are apprehended, are to be ascribed to the "*Jacobins and Levellers*"; in other words,

the *parl*
for twen
they da
ment, a
been ob
never ha
been rej
been wh
nions, t
my mot
They ha
words,
right to
moment
of power
Sir, the
series;
them; t
more th
this sec
now saf
their tri
heart o
sary to
houses;
quire gu
the cou
are ere
and ne
ministe
and th
the act
your t
things
twenty
" bins
Reform
have n
They
and m
have,
make
who h
unless
or the
to som
of pur
at Ch
becom
Gover
are ne
dange
most
whate
Napo
said,
this
Sauri

the *parliamentary reformers*. They have, for twenty years past, opposed, as far as they dared, the measures of the government, and for twenty years past they have been objects of persecution. They have never had any power; all their advice has been rejected; and not a few of them have been wholly ruined for uttering their opinions, those opinions, which, according to my motto, they had a right to express. They had before been told, in the same words, that they had a full and perfect right to express their opinions; but, the moment they did express them, the hand of power crushed them to the earth. Well, Sir, they have been beaten by their adversaries; the antijacobins prevailed over them; many of them lost their lives, and more their health and property; but, has this secured their opponents? Are they now safe? Is the contest likely to end in their triumph? There are troubles in the heart of the kingdom; soldiers are necessary to protect gentlemen in their country houses; the arms of the Local Militia require guarding; troops are stationed round the court of justice at Chester; barracks are erected near almost every large town, and new ones are proposed; the prime minister is shot in the House of Commons, and the great mass of the people applaud the act; threatening letters are sent even to your Royal Highness. These are the things which we behold at the end of twenty years of prosecution of the "Jacobins and Levellers," that is to say, the Reformers. These prosecutions, then, have not produced much good in the end. They have grown, year after year, more and more frequent, till, at last, men have, in many instances, been afraid to make any use at all of the press. Those who have still written have been compelled, unless they wrote in favour of the ministry or the court, to have recourse to fable, or to some other of the shifts, which a dread of punishment suggests. But, still *judges at Chester have guards; bank notes are become a legal tender; and the French have become masters of the Continent of Europe.* Government prosecutions against the press are not, then, an infallible cure for national dangers: Attorney Generals are not the most efficient of statesmen; special juries, whatever else they can do, cannot reach Napoleon. If, indeed, as I have often said, our Attorney General could prosecute this gentleman; if our Gibbses or our Saurins could stick one of their informations upon him; if they could get him

before a judge and a special jury; if they could do this, it would be something; but this they cannot do. He is beyond their grasp.

It is quite amusing to hear the several speech-makers talking of the "*alarming situation of the country.*" To hear them, one would imagine, that *they* and the *parliament* had had no hand in the public measures for the last twenty years. One would imagine, that they were all *new people*, just come forward to save the nation, which had been plunged into ruin by its own folly or wickedness. But, Sir, the people of England and of Ireland too have sense enough to know, that the same men, who are now upon the stage, have been upon the stage during the last twenty years; the people have sense enough to know, that, when alternately in power, none of these men have done any thing for public liberty; the people know that these men, who pretended to be alarmed at the progress of anarchy in 1793, and who now are really alarmed at the result of their own measures, have never shown any disposition to lessen the public burdens, and that, however they may have differed as to other matters, they have all joined in resisting inquiry into the trafficking in seats and other acts of corruption. The *people*, therefore, Sir, are very far indeed from *participating in their alarms*. Their alarms do not alarm the people. Some how or other there is very little sympathy here. The people, in fact, hear none of them talk of a relinquishment of any part of what they receive out of the taxes; the people hear of nothing, as relating to themselves, but new taxes, new barracks, and new penal laws; and, while this is the case, it can make little difference to them in whose hands the power is lodged. Your Royal Highness has been called upon to form a ministry upon a *broad basis*, such as the *alarming crisis* demands. But, those who give you this advice, should have pointed out to you the *cause of the alarm*. They have not done this, because to have done this would have been to pass a censure upon the measures that they have supported for many years past. It would, indeed, have been to condemn the system altogether; and that would not have suited their purpose. The talk about "*a strong ministry*" is, if looked into, nonsense. What is the *strength* that a ministry wants? The talents of three or four men, understanding finance and diplomatic concerns. That is all. What these talkers mean by

strength is, capability of commanding votes; and this is a sort of strength which is by no means calculated to mend the affairs of the nation. If, indeed, the bank notes could be restored to their former value by votes; if the manufacturers could be set to work by votes; if the national debt could be paid off by votes; if Napoleon could be voted out of Spain and Holland and Italy; if votes could make the French nation fools or cowards—if votes had the power to do any of these, it would be proper to call a ministry with a large majority a *strong* ministry. But, none of these things are to be done by votes; and, therefore, the epithet is wholly inapplicable. What is wanted is, not a *strong* ministry; but an *honest* ministry, who would soon give us a reformed House of Commons, who, by a great reduction in the expenditure and the taxes, would give us the best chance of content, tranquillity and happiness. That the choice of your Royal Highness may be fixed on such a ministry is the earnest prayer of,—Your faithful and most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

*State Prison, Newgate,
Thursday, 4th June, 1812.*

* * * I must still postpone my remarks upon the prosecution and punishment of Mr. EATON, for publishing the third and last part of PAINE'S AGE OF REASON. I intend to follow it with some account of the unexpected retreat of SIR VICARY GIBBS, now become "Judge Gibbs," being appointed to a PUISNE judgship in the Court of Common Pleas. I wish he had been out of place for five or six months under an administration different from the last! But, perhaps (which is not unnatural) he did not wish this for precisely the same reason that I did wish it. However, he is now a *judge*, and, of course, he will find a place in the "History of the English, Welsh, "Scotch, and Irish Judges, from 1792 to "the present time, including an account of "some of their most memorable decisions," which work will, I understand, be published at Philadelphia in the course of the month of October or November next. This will be a very entertaining work, if it be well executed; especially as it will, I am told, take into view all the *relations* of the different Judges.

An HISTORICAL PRINT, dedicated to this Nation, engraved by WILLIAM SHARP, of BOADICEA, the British Queen, animating the Britons

to defend their Country against the Romans. Price £1. 1.

Also, a HEAD of ZENOBLA, from a Study of Michael Angelo. Price 10s. 6d. By the same. Sold at Mr. SHARP'S, 27, London-street, Fitzroy Square; Messrs. COLNAGHI, Cockspur-street; CLAY, Ludgate-Hill; and LAMBE, Fleet-street.

AMERICAN DOCUMENTS

Relative to Mr. HENRY'S MISSION, accompanying the Message of the President of the United States, of the 12th of March, 1812, to both Houses of Congress in America.

(Continued from page 704.)

Boston, March 29, 1809.

Sir,—Since my letter of the 13th, nothing has occurred which I thought worthy of a communication. The last weeks of this month, and the first of April, will be occupied in the election of Governors and other Executive Officers in the New England States. The Federal candidate in New Hampshire is already elected by a majority of 1,000 votes. His competitor was a man of large fortune, extensive connexions, and inoffensive manners. These account for the smallness of the majority. In Connecticut no change is necessary, and none is to be apprehended. In Rhode Island, it is of no consequence of what party the Governor is a member, as he has neither civil nor military powers, being merely President of the Council. In Massachusetts, it is certain that the Federal candidate will succeed. A few weeks will be sufficient in order to determine the relative strength of parties, and convince Mr. Madison that a war with Great Britain is not a measure upon which he dare venture. Since the plan of an organized opposition to the measures of Mr. Jefferson was put into operation, the whole of the New-England States have transferred their political power to his political enemies,—and the reason that he has still so many adherents is, that those who consider the only true policy of America to consist in the cultivation of peace, have still great confidence, that nothing can force him (or his successor, who acts up to his system, or rather is governed by it) to consent to war. They consider all the menaces, and "dreadful note of preparation," to be a mere finesse, intended only to obtain concessions from England on cheap terms. From every sort of evidence, I confess I am myself of the same opinion—and am fully persuaded,

that the farce which has been acting at Washington, will terminate in a full proof of the imbecility and spiritless temper of the actors. A war, attempted without the concurrence of both parties, and the general consent of the Northern States, which constitute the bone and muscle of the country, must commence without hope, and end in disgrace. It should, therefore, be the peculiar care of Great Britain to foster divisions between the North and South—and, by succeeding in this, she may carry into effect her own objects in Europe, with a total disregard of the resentment of the democrats of this country. I am, &c. A. B.

Boston, April 13, 1809.

Sir,—I send to Mr. R. a pamphlet entitled “Suppressed Documents.” The notes and comments were written by the gentleman who has written the “Analysis,” which I sent by a former conveyance. These works have greatly contributed to excite the fears of the men of talents and property; who now prefer the chance of maintaining their party by open resistance and a final separation, to an alliance with France and a war with England. So that should the government unexpectedly, and contrary to all reasonable calculation, attempt to involve the country in a measure of that nature, I am convinced (now that the elections have all terminated favourably) that none of the New England States would be a party in it. But, as I have repeatedly written, the General Government does not seriously entertain any such desire or intention. Had the majority in the New England States continued to approve of the public measures, it is extremely probable that Great Britain would now have to choose between war and concession. But the aspect of things, in this respect, is changed; and a war would produce an incurable alienation of the Eastern States, and bring the whole country into subordination to the interests of England, whose navy would prescribe and enforce the terms upon which the commercial States should carry, and the agricultural States export, their surplus produce. All this is as well known to the democrats as to the other party; therefore, they will avoid a war, at least until the whole nation is unanimous for it. Still, when we consider of what materials the Government is formed, it is impossible to speak with any certainty of their measures. The past administration in every transaction presents to the mind only a muddy commixture of

folly, weakness, and duplicity. The spell, by which the nations of Europe have been rendered inert and inefficient, when they attempted to shake it off, has stretched its shadows across the Atlantic, and made a majority of the people of these States, alike blind to duty and to their true interests.

I am, &c. A. B.

Boston, April 26, 1809.

Sir,—Since my letter, No. 1, I have had but little to communicate. I have not yet been able to ascertain with sufficient accuracy, the relative strength of the two parties in the Legislative Bodies in New England. In all of these States, however, Governors have been elected out of the Federal Party, and even the Southern Papers indicate an unexpected augmentation of Federal Members in the next Congress. The Correspondence between Mr. Erskine and the Secretary of State, at Washington, you will have seen before this can reach you. It has given much satisfaction to the Federal Party here, because it promises an exemption from the evil they most feared,—a war with England, and justifies their partiality towards Great Britain, which they maintain was founded upon a full conviction of her justice and sincere disposition to preserve peace. Even the democrats affect to be satisfied with it, because, as they insist, it proves the efficacy of the restrictive system of Mr. Jefferson. But the great benefit that will probably result from it, will be, that Bonaparte may be induced to force this country from her neutral position. Baffled in his attempts to exclude from this Continent the manufactures of Great Britain, he will, most likely, confiscate all American property in his dominions and dependencies, and declare war. Nothing could more than this contribute to give influence and stability to the British party. The invidious occurrences of the rebellion would be forgotten in the resentment of the people against France; and they would soon be weaned from that attachment to her, which is founded on the aid that was rendered to separate from the mother country. While Great Britain waits for this natural, I might say necessary, result of the negotiation, would it not be extremely inexpedient to conclude a treaty with the American Government? Every sort of evidence and experience prove, that the democrats consider their political ascendancy, in a great measure, dependent upon the hostile spirit that they can keep alive towards Great Britain, and recent events demon-

strate, that their conduct will be predicated upon that conviction. It is, therefore, not to be expected, that they will meet with corresponding feelings, a sincere disposition on the part of England, to adjust all matters in dispute. They are at heart mortified and disappointed, to find that Great Britain has been in advance of the French Government, in taking advantage of the provisional clauses of the Non-Intercourse Law; and if they shew any spirit at the next Session of Congress towards France, it will be only because they find Bonaparté deaf to entreaty, and insensible of past favours; or that they may think it safer to float with the tide of public feeling, which will set strongly against him, unless he keep *pari passu* with England, in a conciliatory policy. When I began my letter, I intended to make some observations, in relation to the boundary line,—[Here ten or twelve lines of the manuscript are erased.]

I am, &c. A. B.

Mr. Ryland to Mr. Henry, May 1, 1809.

My dear Sir,—The news we have received this day from the States, will, I imagine, soon bring you back to us; and if you arrive at Montreal by the middle of June, I shall probably have the pleasure of meeting you there, as I am going up with Sir James and a large suite. The last letters received from you are to the 13th of April; the whole are now transcribing for the purpose of being sent home, where they cannot fail of doing you great credit, and I most sincerely hope that they may eventually contribute to your permanent advantage. It is not necessary to repeat the assurance, that no effort within the compass of my power shall be wanting to this end. I am cruelly out of spirits at the idea of Old England truckling to such a debased and accursed Government as that of the United States. I am greatly obliged to you for the trouble you have taken in procuring the books; though, if Spain fails, I shall scarcely have heart to look in them. I can add no more now, but that I am most heartily and affectionately your's,

H. W. R.

J. Henry, Esq. Boston.

Mr. Ryland to Mr. Henry, dated 4th May, 1809.

My dear Sir,—You must consider the short letter I wrote you by the last post as altogether unofficial; but I am now to intimate to you, in a more formal manner, our

hope of your speedy return, as the object of your journey seems, for the present at least, to be at an end. We have London news by the way of the river, up to the 6th of March, which tallies to a day with what we have received by the way of the States. Heartily wishing you a safe and speedy journey back to us, I am, my dear Sir, most sincerely your's,—H. W. R.

Have the goodness to bring my books with you, though I shall have but little spirit to look into them, unless you bring good news from Spain.

Extracts of Letters of Recall from the Mission, in consequence of the arrangement entered into between Mr. Erskine and the American Government.

Quebec, May, 1809.

The news we have received this day from the United States, will, I imagine, soon bring you back to us. The last letters received from you are to the 13th April. The whole are now transcribing to be sent home, where they cannot fail of doing you great credit, and eventually contribute to your permanent advantage.

H. W. RYLAND, Sec.

J. Henry, Esq.

4th May, 1809.

I am now formally to intimate to you our hope of your return—as the object of your mission seems, for the present, at least, to be abandoned. Sincerely wishing you a safe and speedy journey back to us, I am, &c.

H. W. RYLAND, Sec.

J. Henry, Esq.

Boston, May 5, 1809.

Sir,—Although the recent changes that have occurred, quiet all apprehensions of war, and, consequently, lessen all hope of a separation of the States, I think it necessary to transmit by the mail of each week, a sketch of passing events. On local politics I have nothing to add; and as the parade that is made in the National Intelligencer, of the sincere disposition of Mr. Madison to preserve amicable relations with Great Britain is, in my opinion, calculated to awaken vigilance and distrust, rather than inspire confidence, I shall (having nothing more important to write about) take leave to examine his motives. I am not surprised at his conditional removal of the Non-Intercourse Law, with respect to Great Britain, because it was made incumbent upon him by the Act of Congress; but the observations made on his friendly

dispos
matte
whole
and u
speec
attem
“ Bri
his co
rently
ful, a
while
blage
me, a
sire a
tensi
recog
shoul
tual a
his fi
those
fully
mon
have
and
ever
stage
quirc
He
in th
a wa
tion
by t
incl
prov
to b
the
gond
the
infl
with
grou
pro
eve
his
ly
sur
upo
and
evi
the
tho
ins
pla
con
pr
of

disposition towards Great Britain, is a matter of no little astonishment. The whole tenor of his political life directly and unequivocally contradicts them. His speech on the British treaty, in 1799; his attempt to pass a law for the confiscation of "British debts," and British property; his commercial resolutions, grounded apparently on an idea of making America useful, as a colony, to France; his conduct while Secretary of State, all form an assemblage of probabilities tending to convince me, at least, that he does not seriously desire a treaty in which the rights and pretensions of Great Britain would be fairly recognized. It seems impossible that he should at once divest himself of his habitual animosity, and that he should deprive his friends and supporters of the benefit of those prejudices, which have been carefully fostered up in the minds of the common people towards England, and which have so materially contributed to invigorate and augment the Democratic party. Whatever his real motives may be, it is in this stage of the affair, harmless enough to inquire into the cause of the apparent change. He probably acts under a conviction, that in the present temper of the Eastern States, a war could not fail to produce a dissolution of the Union; or he may have profited by the mistakes of his predecessor; and is inclined to seize the present opportunity to prove to the world, that he is determined to be the President of a Nation, rather than the head of a faction; or he has probably gone thus far to remove the impression on the mind of many, that he was under the influence of France, in order that he may, with a better grace, and on more tenable grounds, quarrel with Great Britain in the progress of negotiating a treaty. Whatever his motives may be, I am very certain his party will not support him in any manly and generous policy. Weak men are sure to temporize when great events call upon them for decision, and are sluggish and inert at the moment when the worst of evils is in action. This is the character of the Democrats in the Northern States. Of those of the South I know but little.

I am, &c. A. B.

Boston, May 25, 1809.

Sir,—My last was under date of the 5th inst. The unexpected change that has taken place in the feelings of political men in this country, in consequence of Mr. Madison's prompt acceptance of the friendly proposals of Great Britain, has caused a temporary

suspension of the conflict of parties; and they both regard him with equal wonder and distrust. They all ascribe his conduct to various motives, but none believe him to be in earnest. The State of New York has returned to the Assembly a majority of Federal Members. All this proves, that an anti-commercial faction cannot rule the Northern States. Two months ago, the State of New York was not ranked among the States that would adopt the policy of that of Massachusetts; and any favourable change was exceedingly problematical. I beg leave to suggest, that in the present state of things in this country, my presence can contribute very little to the interests of Great Britain. If Mr. Erskine be sanctioned in all he has conceded, by His Majesty's Ministers, it is unnecessary for me, as indeed it would be unavailing, to make any attempt to carry into effect the original purposes of my mission. While I think it to be my duty to give this intimation to you, I beg it may be understood that I consider myself as entirely at the disposal of His Majesty's Government.—I am, &c. A. B.

Montreal, June 12, 1809.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform your Excellency that I received, through Mr. Secretary Ryland, your Excellency's commands to return to Canada; and, after the delays incident to this season of the year, in a journey from Boston, arrived here yesterday. Your Excellency will have seen, by the papers of the latest dates from the United States, that a formidable opposition is already organized in Congress to the late measures of Mr. Madison; and it is very evident, that if he be sincere in his professions of attachment to Great Britain, his party will abandon him. Sixty-one Members have already voted against a resolution to approve of what he has done; and I have no doubt the rest of the democratic party will follow the example as soon as they recover from the astonishment into which his apparent defection has thrown them. The present hopes of the Federalists are founded on the probability of a war with France; but, at all events, this party is strong and well organized enough to prevent a war with England. It would now be superfluous to trouble your Excellency with an account of the nature and extent of the arrangements made by the Federal party, to resist any attempt of the Government unfavourable to Great Britain. They were such as to do great credit to their ability and principles: and, while a judicious

policy is observed by Great Britain, secure her interests in America from decay. My fear of inducing a false security on the part of His Majesty's Government, in their inefficiency and eventual success, may have inclined me to refrain from doing them that justice in my former letters, which I willingly take the present occasion to express. I trust your Excellency will ascribe the style and manner of my communications, and the frequent ambiguities introduced in them, as arising from the secrecy necessary to be observed, and my consciousness that you understood my meaning on the most delicate points, without risking a particular explanation. I lament that no occasion, commensurate to my wishes, has permitted me to prove how much I value the confidence of your Excellency, and the approbation already expressed by His Majesty's Ministers. I have the honour to be, &c.

I certify that the foregoing letters are the same referred to in the letter of H. W. Ryland, Esq. dated May 1, 1809, relating to the mission in which I was employed by Sir James Craig, by his letter of instructions, bearing date Feb. 6, 1809.

(Signed) JOHN HENRY.

Mr. Ryland to Mr. Henry.

Tuesday Evening, July 2, 1811.

Dear Henry,—It gives me real pleasure to find that the apprehensions I had formed with respect to the fulfilment of your expectations, is likely to prove erroneous. As every thing which passed relative to your mission was in writing, I think you will do well in submitting to Mr. Peel all the original papers. I myself, could give no other information relative to what they contain, as you and I had no other opportunity of any verbal communication respecting it, till after your mission terminated; and I never wrote to you a letter in the Governor's name, which had not previously been submitted to his correction. The impression I had received of your character and abilities made me anxious to serve you, even before I had the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with you, and the same desire has operated on me ever since; I am, therefore, entitled to hope, that any opinion which I may have given you, as to your best mode of obtaining an employment under Government, will be received with the same candour that gave rise to it; I think you will do well to persevere as you propose. I have no doubt that every letter from you which Sir James sent home, will

be found in Mr. Peel's office, as the established practice there is to bind the dispatches and enclosures yearly up together. Sincerely wishing you every success, I am, most faithfully, your's,

H. W. RYLAND.

Mr. Henry's Memorial, to Lord Liverpool, enclosed in a Letter to Mr. Peel, of the 13th June, 1811, with a copy of that letter.

The undersigned most respectfully submits the following statement and memorial to the Earl of Liverpool:—Long before and during the administration of your lordship's predecessor, the undersigned bestowed much personal attention to the state of parties and to the political measures in the United States of America—[Here is an erasure of about four lines.] Soon after the affair of the *Chesapeake* frigate, when His Majesty's Governor-General of British America had reason to believe that the two countries would be involved in a war, *and had submitted to His Majesty's Ministers the arrangements of the English party in the United States, for an efficient resistance to the General Government, which would probably terminate in a separation of the northern states from the general confederacy; he applied to the undersigned to take a mission to Boston, where the whole concerns of the opposition were managed.* The object of this mission was to promote and encourage the Federal party to resist the measures of the General Government; to offer assurances of aid and support from His Majesty's Government of Canada; *and to open a communication between the leading men engaged in that opposition and the Governor General, upon such a footing, as circumstances might suggest; and, finally, to render the plans then in contemplation subservient to the views of His Majesty's Government.** The undersigned undertook the mission which lasted from the month of January to the month of June, inclusive, during which period those public acts and legislative resolutions of the Assemblies of Massachusetts and Connecticut were passed, which kept the General Government of the United States in check, and deterred it from carrying into execution the measures of hostility with which Great Britain was menaced. For his services on the occasion herein recited, and the loss of

* Vide the Dispatches of Sir J. Craig, in June, 1808.

time and expenses incurred, the undersigned neither sought nor received any compensation; but trusted to the known justice and liberality of His Majesty's Government, for the reward of services which could not, he humbly conceives, be estimated in pounds, shillings, and pence. On the patronage and support which was promised in the letter of Sir J. Craig, under date of the 16th Jan. 1806, (wherein he gives an assurance) "That the former correspondence and political information, transmitted to the undersigned, had met with the particular approbation of His Majesty's Secretary of State; and that his execution of the mission (proposed to be undertaken in that letter) would give a claim not only on the Governor General, but on His Majesty's Ministers;" the undersigned has relied, and now most respectfully claims, in whatever mode the Earl of Liverpool may be pleased to adopt. The undersigned most respectfully takes this occasion to state, that Sir J. Craig promised him an employment in Canada, worth upwards of one thousand pounds a year, by his letter (herewith transmitted), under date of the 13th September, 1809, which he has just learned has, in consequence of his absence, been given to another person. The undersigned abstains from commenting on this transaction; and most respectfully suggests that the appointment of Judge-Advocate-General of the Province of Lower Canada, with a salary of five hundred pounds a year, or a Consulate in the U. *sine curia*, would be considered by him a liberal discharge of any obligation that His Majesty's Government may entertain in relation to his services.

*Copy of a Letter to Mr. Peel, enclosing
the foregoing.*

Sir,—I take the liberty to enclose to you a Memorial, addressed to the Earl of Liverpool; and beg you will have the goodness either to examine the documents in your office, or those in my possession, touching the extent and legitimacy of my claims. Mr. Ryland, the Secretary of Sir J. Craig, is now in London; and, from his official knowledge of the transactions and facts alluded to in the Memorial, can give any information required on that subject. I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed) J. HENRY.

June 13, 1811.

Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool, by his Secretary, R. Peel, Esq., recognizing Mr. Henry's services, &c.

Downing-street, June 28, 1811.

Sir,—I have not failed to lay before the Earl of Liverpool, the Memorial, together with several enclosures, which was delivered to me a few days since, by Gen. Loft, at your desire. His Lordship has directed me to acquaint you, that he has referred to the correspondence in this office, of the year 1809, and finds two letters from Sir James Craig, dated 10th April, and 5th May, transmitting the correspondence that has passed during your residence in the Northern States of America, and expressing his confidence in your ability and judgment; but Lord Liverpool has not discovered any wish on the part of Sir James Craig, that your claims for compensation should be referred to this country; nor, indeed, is allusion made to any kind of arrangement or agreement that had been made by that officer to you. Under these circumstances, and had not Sir James Craig determined on his immediate return to England, it would have been Lord Liverpool's wish to have referred your Memorial to him, as being better enabled to appreciate the ability and success with which you executed a mission, undertaken at his desire. Lord Liverpool will, however, transmit to Sir James Craig's successor in the Government, with an assurance, that, from the recommendations he has received in your favour, and the opinion he has formed on your correspondence, he is convinced that the public service will be benefited by your active employment in a public situation. Lord Liverpool will also feel himself bound to give the same assurance to the Marquis Wellesley, if there is any probability that it will advance the success of the application which you have made to his Lordship.—I am, Sir, your most obedient humble servant,

(Signed) ROBERT PEEL.
John Henry, Esq. 27, Leicester-square.

LORD LIVERPOOL'S DISPATCH.
(Original.)

To Sir George Prevost, Governor General of Canada, with its enclosures, dated Sept. 16, 1811.

Downing-street.

Sir,—Mr. Henry, who will have the honour of delivering this letter, is the Gentleman who addressed to me the memorial,

(a copy of which I herewith transmit) and to whom the accompanying letter from Mr. Peel was written by my direction. In compliance with his request, I now fulfil the assurance which I have given of stating to you my opinion of the ability and judgment which Mr. Henry has manifested on the occasions mentioned in his memorial, and of the benefit the public service might derive from his active employment in any public situation in which you should think proper to place him. I am, Sir, your most obedient humble servant,

(Signed) LIVERPOOL.

To Sir George Prevost, Bart. &c.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

ENGLAND.—*Declaration, relative to the Orders in Council.*—Dated, Westminster, 21st April, 1812.

The Government of France having, by an Official Report, communicated by its Ministers for Foreign Affairs to the Conservative Senate on the 10th day of March last, removed all doubts as to the perseverance of that Government in the assertion of principles, and in the maintenance of a system, not more hostile to the maritime rights and commercial interests of the British Empire, than inconsistent with the rights and independence of neutral nations; and having thereby plainly developed the inordinate pretensions which that system, as promulgated in the Decrees of Berlin and Milan, was from the first designed to enforce; His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, acting in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, deems it proper, upon this formal and authentic republication of the principles of those Decrees, thus publicly to declare His Royal Highness's determination still firmly to resist the introduction and establishment of this arbitrary Code, which the Government of France openly avows its purpose to impose by force upon the world, as the Law of Nations.—From the time that the progressive injustice and violence of the French Government made it impossible for His Majesty any longer to restrain the exercise of the rights of war within their ordinary limits, without submitting to consequences

not less ruinous to the commerce of his dominions, than derogatory to the rights of his crown, His Majesty has endeavoured by a restricted and moderate use of those rights of retaliation, which the Berlin and Milan Decrees necessarily called into action, to reconcile neutral states to those measures, which the conduct of the enemy had rendered unavoidable; and which His Majesty at all times professed his readiness to revoke, so soon as the Decrees of the enemy, which gave occasion to them, should be formally and unconditionally repealed, and the commerce of neutral nations restored to its accustomed course.—At a subsequent period of the war, His Majesty, availing himself of the then situation of Europe, without abandoning the principle and object of the Orders in Council of Nov. 1807, was induced so to limit their operation, as materially to alleviate the restrictions thereby imposed upon neutral commerce. The Order in Council of April, 1809, was substituted in the room of those of November, 1807; and the retaliatory system of Great Britain acted no longer on every country in which the aggressive measures of the enemy were in force, but was confined in its operation to France, and to the countries upon which the French yoke was most strictly imposed; and which had become virtually a part of the dominions of France.—The United States of America remained nevertheless dissatisfied; and their dissatisfaction has been greatly increased by an artifice too successfully employed on the part of the enemy, who has pretended that the decrees of Berlin and Milan were repealed, although the decree affecting such repeal has never been promulgated; although the notification of such pretended repeal distinctly described it to be dependent on conditions, in which the enemy knew Great Britain could never acquiesce; and although abundant evidence has since appeared of their subsequent execution.—But the enemy has at length laid aside all dissimulation; he now publicly and solemnly declares, not only that those Decrees still continue in force, but that they shall be rigidly executed until Great Britain shall comply with additional conditions equally extra-

(To be continued.)